



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,749	08/13/2002	Robert David Darrow	RD27658	8455
41838 7590 07/09/2008 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (PCPI) C/O FLETCHER YODER P. O. BOX 692289 HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289				
			EXAMINER LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patnode@crd.ge.com  
rosssr@crd.ge.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/064,749

**Applicant(s)**

DARROW ET AL.

**Examiner**

JOEL M. LAMPRECHT

**Art Unit**

3737

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-17 and 19-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-17, 19-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Upon reconsideration by the Examiner, the previous grounds of rejection have been withdrawn and the following new grounds of rejection have been set forth.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-17, 19-22, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. *Claim 13 and the corresponding arguments of record with regard to claim 13 appear to claim that the processor responds to change in the position of a medical device by **repositioning** the medical device within a target region of interest with moving the subject.* A thorough and complete search of Applicant's specification has provided no such teaching or capability of the processor element. Independent claims 1, 23 and 32 are not included in this rejection as they do not explicitly recite that the system itself repositions the medical device, rather that the system (or method) provides feedback to **assist** in repositioning (emphasis added). Reasonable interpretations of the word repositioning include performing any part of a process which would ultimately lead to placing

Art Unit: 3737

something in a new or updated position; however, as claimed are argued currently, there is no indication that this is the intent of Applicant.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 28-30 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 28 sets forth no additional steps in the method, only a suggestion of intended use and claims 29-30 set forth no additional structural limitations. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dumoulin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,251,635).

Regarding Claims 1, 7, and 23, Dumoulin et al. '635 teaches a medical device positioning system and method including a medical device adapted for internal use for performing the medical procedure, an imaging device (col. 1, lines 60-63), a medical device monitoring and positioning subsystem (col. 2, lines 2-10, 61-66, and 68) for monitoring the position of the medical device relative to a target region of interest within the subject and for providing feedback to an interface unit and responding to motion of

Art Unit: 3737

at least one of the medical device or the subject in a predetermined fashion when the position of the medical device deviates from the target region of interest (col. 3, lines 1-4, 12-16 and 35-39), a tracking device, a processor coupled to the medical imaging device and the tracking device for generating images of the region of interest with a visual representation of the medical device superimposed on the images, where the processor is further adapted to monitor a position of the medical device relative to the region of interest and to respond to changes in the position and provide feedback to an interface and where the operator initiates image acquisition at a selected location through an interface which is adapted to respond to the operator's input (col. 4, lines 16-19 and col. 7, lines 24-43).

Regarding Claims 2, 4-6, Dumoulin et al. '635 teaches a monitoring subsystem that is adapted to receive configuration information that is tracking method information corresponding to the medical device (col. 3, lines 1-4 and 22-25), that has a predetermined response of activating the imaging system to acquire a new image in response to the movement of the medical device relative to the target region within the subject, that provides advisory feedback to the interface unit when the medical device deviates from a target position (col. 4, lines 19-21, 25-35, 42-46 and 68), where the advisory feedback is a visual icon representing the position of the device (col. 5, line 1 and col. 7, lines 24-39).

Regarding Claims 8-10, and 26-29 Dumoulin et al. '635 teaches an imaging device that may be an MRI scanner, an X-ray device, a PET system, an ultrasound scanner or any other similar medical diagnostic imaging device, an invasive device that

Art Unit: 3737

may be at least one of a biopsy needle guide, an invasive probe, an ablation device, a laparoscope and a therapeutic laser (col. 1, lines 60-63, col. 2, lines 25-28), an interface where the operator selects the desired position of the device and a coupling between the interface and the processor for displaying the images representing the region of interest and the medical device (col. 3, lines 1-4, col. 4, lines 22-48) where the interface is used for positioning the medical device and responding to movement of the medical device in real time, such that the feedback provided to the interface can be used to navigate the device to a region of interest (col. 7, lines 31-43 and 61-68 and col. 8, lines 1-3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 3737

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Dumoulin et al. ('635) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dumoulin et al. ('635).

Regarding Claims 24, 25, and 32, Dumoulin et al. disclose all that is listed above, and also discloses advisory feedback when the medical device deviates from a target position in the form of updating the image on the monitor or interface visual output of the system including the icon of the device and the region of interest (Col 3 Line 25-Col 4 Line 50 and Col 7 Line 24-47). While this embodiment does not explicitly disclose providing a *text advisory*, the monitor is *capable of displaying text*. In the alternative, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the advisory from *image feedback* as taught by Dumoulin et al. to *text feedback* as an alternative functional equivalent to produce feedback to the operator in lieu of constantly updated images provides feedback to the user in a predetermined fashion that allows for the user to choose to terminate therapy, continue with therapy, move the device without moving the patient, or any other response that someone skilled in the art would reasonably provide.

Claims 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumoulin et al. '635, and further in view of Panescu et al. Dumoulin et al. '635 teaches all of the features of the present invention except that the monitoring subsystem

receives configuration information about the device that is a model representation, where that information corresponds to a visual representation of the device for superimposing on the images acquired, and where the visual representation is a wire-frame model of the device.

In the same field of endeavor, Panescu et al. teaches a system for locating and positioning a catheter within a body where configuration information about the device is entered into the processing system (col. 6, lines 56-59). Panescu et al. also teaches that a graphical representation of the device may be provided and that the representation may be used in combination with the fluoroscopic images of the position of the device (col. 6, lines 31-46). Further, Panescu et al. teaches that a wire-frame image of the device may be used (col. 6, lines 47-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the configuration input scheme and visual representations of Panescu et al. with the system of Dumoulin et al. in order to provide the operator with improved orientation of the device within the subject (see for motivation Panescu et al. at col. 5, lines 65-67 and col. 6, lines 6-12).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Twiss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,375,596) maintains teachings of audio feedback from a device positioning system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL M. LAMPRECHT whose telephone number is (571)272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ruth S. Smith/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3737

JML